

NGM Fee Schedule

Litman v. Goldberg, Index No. 524343/2025 (N.Y. Sup. Ct., Kings County) — Hon. Brian L. Gotlieb, J.S.C.

Track assignment. This fee schedule sits on the contract / arbitration enforcement track. It measures the commercial value of specific legal services rendered through NGM's billing system, tied to the contractual 20% originating-attorney share. It does *not* purport to measure § 51 damages — under New York Civil Rights Law §§ 50–51, damages are measured by the cumulative commercial use of Mr. Litman's name and identity, not by per-invoice fees. See separate Track 2 deliverables (the exhibit binders and saturation decks) for that analysis.

Source and Methodology

Source. No formal NGM fee schedule was produced in discovery. All rates below are empirical averages drawn from NGM's own revenue records — principally the NGM_Litman_Workup.xlsx master ledger (137,239 rows) and the KFU/KSU billing reconciliation ledger (3,154 lines, Goldberg production June 2025). Industry benchmarks are provided for comparison (per American Intellectual Property Law Association Economic Surveys and public fee schedules of comparable boutique firms).

Use. These rates document the commercial value of each service category that NGM billed under Mr. Litman's name. For patents with client-specific fees documented (the 14 exemplars below), those documented amounts control. All other matters apply the service-type averages.

Per-Service Fee Summary

Service Type	NGM Avg Fee	NGM Range	Industry Benchmark	Source (NGM Transactions)
Full Utility Patent Prosecution	\$2,848 (skewed)	\$385–\$7,625 avg / up to \$21,044 on exemplar 11,976,365	\$10,000–\$25,000	NGM revenue sheet (n=4 avg line items, 18 exemplar dockets)
Office Action Response (Patent)	\$606	\$70–\$4,500	\$500–\$2,000	NGM revenue sheet (n=105)
Design Patent Application	\$1,623	\$60–\$3,220	\$1,500–\$4,500	NGM revenue sheet (n=10)
Continuation / Divisional / CIP Filing	\$629	\$52–\$6,000	\$800–\$3,000	NGM revenue sheet (n=521)
Issue Fee / Notice of Allowance	\$424	\$52–\$2,000	\$300–\$600	NGM revenue sheet (n=1,265)
Trademark Filing (TEAS)	\$617	\$135–\$1,075	\$500–\$1,200	NGM revenue sheet (n=112)
Trademark Declaration of Use	\$340	\$72–\$875	\$250–\$500	NGM revenue sheet (n=253)
Trademark Office Action Response	\$599	\$99–\$4,500	\$500–\$1,500	NGM revenue sheet (n=107)
Patent Assignment Recording	\$148	\$54–\$450	\$100–\$300	NGM revenue sheet (n=54)
Maintenance Fee	\$398	\$52–\$750	\$300–\$600	NGM revenue sheet (n=238)
Power of Attorney (82A)	\$111	\$52–\$553	\$75–\$200	NGM revenue sheet (n=115)
Client Correspondence / Status Update	\$213	\$52–\$4,595	\$150–\$400	NGM revenue sheet (n=1,486)

Documented Exemplar Patent Fees (KFU/KSU Reconciliation)

The following 14 patents are mapped to exact docket-level fees in NGM's KFU/KSU reconciliation (produced June 2025). These patents are the only ones with docket-level revenue linkage in the 905-patent universe (98.0% of the 905 patents bearing Litman's name have no docket mapping in available data — see output/PATENT_REVENUE_LINKAGE_SUMMARY.md).

Patent No.	Docket	Client	Billed	Collected
11,881,807	33110.68U	KFU	\$15,800	\$13,400
11,932,607	33135.26U	KFU	\$12,360	\$12,360
11,976,365	33101.73U	KFU	\$21,044	\$18,644
11,980,937	33150.15U	KFU	\$3,560	\$3,560
12,043,608	33120.91U	KFU	\$17,400	\$17,400
12,043,609	33130.47U	KFU	\$15,800	\$15,800
12,049,459	33120.88U	KFU	\$15,160	\$15,160
12,054,460	33170.94A	KFU	\$5,000	\$5,000
12,054,464	33175.68A	KFU	\$3,480	\$3,480
12,062,780	33160.59U	KFU	\$12,760	\$12,760
12,065,424	33175.60A	KFU	\$3,480	\$3,480
12,071,437	33150.41U	KFU	\$13,000	\$13,000
12,116,333	33150.71A	KFU	\$8,360	\$8,360
D1,046,141	33056.38	KSU	\$0 (trust)	\$0

Aggregate Revenue Context

From June 15, 2020 through May 31, 2025, NGM recorded **\$22,096,827** in total funds received and **\$16,175,686** in collected fees under Richard C. Litman's name (per NGM revenue sheet). Litman's contracted 20% share would total \$3,235,137 against \$2,730,409 paid, leaving a **\$504,728 documented shortfall**. Q1 2026 (Jan-Mar) extends this by an additional \$18,848 wire on \$127,053 funds received — a 96% drop from Q1 2024, with \$18,848 reflecting only half of the \$188,480 in Q1 2026 fees attributed to RCL in the Payment Allocation reports (see Batch 02 Exhibit 11). Each figure above is a Track 1 data point; Track 2 (§ 51) damages scale differently and are measured separately in the saturation-deck deliverables.

Cross-Reference to Discovery Exhibits

- Batch 01 Exhibits 1–4: documents the USPTO-filing chain for Patent 12,043,608 (KFU, docket 33120.91U, **\$17,400 billed**)
- Batch 02 Exhibit 10: AR Report April 2026 — \$1,302,403.04 billed / \$77,213.28 collected with Richard Litman as Collecting Lawyer on 496 invoices
- Batch 02 Exhibit 12: Litman 2026 Summary — running quarterly compensation calculation (613-row history since 1Q2020)
- Batch 02 Exhibits 13-15: Trust Listings / Trust Register — matter-level trust attribution and the \$1.59M Jan 31→Feb 1, 2026 reassignment, plus the ~\$1.78M phantom BoA balance